



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “An Investigation of Language Assessment Literacy and Classroom-Based Language Testing Practices among EFL Teachers in Saudi Arabia”

Submitted: 13 July 2026

Accepted: 09 August 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Rami Mubarak

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n26p14

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Heba Mostafa Mohamed
Beni Suef University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Forchap Ngang Justine
University Institute of Science and Technology of Central Africa, Cameroon

Reviewer 3: Moayad Ahmad Alshara
University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Grammatically correct, but it would have been better if major words were capitalized consistently.

“Region” may or may not need capitalization.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are minor grammar issues (parallelism, heavy commas)

APA statistical notation inconsistencies

Ambiguous or vague wording (“records,” “verified classroom performance”)

Stylistic redundancy

Cohesion issues in transitions

Pronoun disagreement

“...the language testing practices in his/her classroom.”

“teachers” is plural; “his/her” is singular.

Should be their.

Wordiness / unnecessary repetition

“A survey-based data collection method was used as the main data collection method.”

“data collection method” is repeated.

Awkward phrasing

“A correlational design would be suitable where the objective...”

“where” is incorrect for conditions.

Should b

Overly long, tangled sentence

“Considering that the current research is aimed at understanding naturally occurring variations of the assessment literacy of teachers and the correlation of the variations with the assessment practices of the teachers...”

Repetition of “teachers.”

Heavy nominalization (“variations of the assessment literacy”).

Difficult to read.

Incorrect article usage

“the assessment behaviours and knowledge of teachers”

Should be behavior (US spelling) if the rest of the paper uses US English.

“behaviours” is correct in UK English, but consistency must be checked.

✗ Missing comma

“The dependent variable was the classroom-based language testing practices which represented...”

Needs a comma before which (non-restrictive clause).

Incorrect preposition

“the correlation of the variations with the assessment practices”

More natural: correlation between.

Misuse of “in this regard”

“In this regard, the quantitative correlational design...”

“In this regard” is vague and often discouraged in academic writing.

Misuse of “proper”

“proper statistical methods”

“Proper” implies moral correctness.

Academic writing prefers appropriate.

Ambiguous phrase

“more sound and principled practices of assessment”

“Sound” and “principled” are vague and subjective.

Style & Clarity Issues

Redundancy

“the assessment literacy of teachers”

“the assessment practices of the teachers”

Repetition of “teachers” is unnecessary.

Over-explanation

The paragraph on surveys explains well-known facts in applied linguistics.

Journals often prefer conciseness.

Heavy nominalization

Examples:

“systematic measurement of the assessment behaviours and knowledge”

“naturally occurring variations of the assessment literacy”

These reduce readability.

Passive voice overuse

Not grammatically wrong, but weakens clarity:

“was used”

“was conceptualised”

“was investigated”

“was conducted”

Logical / Conceptual Issues

“redictor” language in cross-sectional design

“treating LAL as the predictor... indicates statistical prediction”

“Prediction” is misleading in cross-sectional correlational studies.

Should emphasize association, not prediction.

“establish the hypothesis of whether...”

Incorrect construction.

Should be “test the hypothesis that...”

. Consistency Issues

Mixed spelling conventions

“behaviours” (UK)

“practices” (US)

“conceptualised” (UK)

Check whether the journal requires US English or UK English.

Inconsistent hyphenation

“survey-based”

“classroom-based”

“foundation-year”

Check consistency across the manuscript.

6. Minor Formatting Issues

S1-S4 should be S1–S4 (en dash for ranges).

Same for S5-S6, U1-U2, U3-U4.

“English-for-specific-purposes” should be English for Specific Purposes (ESP) unless the journal requires hyphenation.

Major duplication of entire sections

Pronoun disagreement

Redundant phrasing

Wordiness and heavy sentences

Incorrect statistical phrasing

Inconsistent English variety (US/UK)

Missing commas and awkward prepositions

Weak transitions and vague expressions

Formatting inconsistencies (dashes, headings)

Pronoun disagreement

“...the language testing practices in his/her classroom.”

“teachers” is plural; “his/her” is singular.

Should be their.

Wordiness / unnecessary repetition

“A survey-based data collection method was used as the main data collection method.”

“data collection method” is repeated.

Awkward phrasing

“A correlational design would be suitable where the objective...”

“where” is incorrect for conditions.

Should be when.

Overly long, tangled sentence

“Considering that the current research is aimed at understanding naturally occurring variations of the assessment literacy of teachers and the correlation of the variations with the assessment practices of the teachers...”

Repetition of “teachers.”

Heavy nominalization (“variations of the assessment literacy”).

Difficult to read.

Incorrect article usage

“the assessment behaviours and knowledge of teachers”

Should be behavior (US spelling) if the rest of the paper uses US English.

“behaviours” is correct in UK English, but consistency must be checked.

Missing comma

“The dependent variable was the classroom-based language testing practices which represented...”

Needs a comma before which (non-restrictive clause).

Incorrect preposition

“the correlation of the variations with the assessment practices”

More natural: correlation between.

Misuse of “in this regard”

“In this regard, the quantitative correlational design...”

“In this regard” is vague and often discouraged in academic writing.

Misuse of “proper”

“proper statistical methods”

“Proper” implies moral correctness.

Academic writing prefers appropriate

Ambiguous phrase

“more sound and principled practices of assessment”

“Sound” and “principled” are vague and subjective.

. Style & Clarity Issues

Redundancy

“the assessment literacy of teachers”

“the assessment practices of the teachers”

Repetition of “teachers” is unnecessary.

Over-explanation

The paragraph on surveys explains well-known facts in applied linguistics.

Heavy nominalization

Examples:

“systematic measurement of the assessment behaviours and knowledge”

“naturally occurring variations of the assessment literacy”

These reduce readability.

Passive voice overuse

Not grammatically wrong, but weakens clarity:

“was used”

“was conceptualised”

“was investigated”

“was conducted”

Logical / Conceptual Issues

“predictor” language in cross-sectional design

“treating LAL as the predictor... indicates statistical prediction”

“Prediction” is misleading in cross-sectional correlational studies.

Should emphasize association, not prediction.

“establish the hypothesis of whether...”

Incorrect construction.

Should be “test the hypothesis that...”

Consistency Issues

Mixed spelling conventions

“behaviours” (UK)

“practices” (US)

“conceptualised” (UK)

Check whether the journal requires US English or UK English.

Inconsistent hyphenation

“survey-based”

“classroom-based”

“foundation-year”

Check consistency across the manuscript.

6. Minor Formatting Issues

S1-S4 should be S1–S4 (en dash for ranges).

Same for S5-S6, U1-U2, U3-U4.

“English-for-specific-purposes” should be English for Specific Purposes (ESP) unless the journal requires hyphenation.

Major duplication of entire sections

Pronoun disagreement

Redundant phrasing

Wordiness and heavy sentences

Incorrect statistical phrasing

Inconsistent English variety (US/UK)

Missing commas and awkward prepositions

Weak transitions and vague expressions

Formatting inconsistencies (dashes, headings)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly but there are some errors.

Section 2 is duplicated in full.

Everything from “2. Method” to the end of 2.2 appears twice.

This is a major structural error.
Heading hierarchy inconsistent.
Method” appears twice.
“2.1 Research Design” appears twice.
This breaks standard academic formatting. Weak methodological justification
Misleading statistical language Table reference
“Table 1 reports...”
Table is not included here; ensure numbering matches the manuscript.
Circular justification
“The study design had a direct relationship with the research questions.”
All study designs relate to research questions; this statement adds no methodological justification.
Weak justification for non-experimental design
The explanation is long but does not clearly articulate why experimental/quasi-experimental designs are infeasible beyond “naturally occurring variations.”
Overly dense sentence
“Construct domains were mapped to work on LAL content and training needs (Fulcher, 2012; Vogt & Tsagari, 2014), situated teacher assessment literacy (Xu & Brown, 2016), language-specific assessment competence (Levi & Inbar-Lourie, 2020), and classroom assessment practice (Phakiti & Steinhoff, 2023)
Four citations in one sentence reduce readability.
“mapped to work on” is unclear.
List lacks parallel structure. No rationale for four-point scale
Why four points?
Why not five or seven?
No justification provided. Formatting Errors
Missing section number
The first paragraph appears before “4.2 Interpretation of Findings” but is not labeled as 4.1.
Citation formatting inconsistency
“Gupta, 2023; Mahar & Khoso, 2025”
Correct, but spacing and punctuation should be checked against journal guidelines.
Paragraph break missing
Inconsistent terminology
You use:
“assessment behaviours”
“assessment practices”
“testing practices”
These may refer to different constructs but are used interchangeably. No mention of pilot sample characteristics
Missing:
Pilot sample size
Demographics
Pilot reliability
Whether pilot feedback informed revisions
No explanation of reviewer agreement.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Missing: Overinterpretation of correlational results
Missing acknowledgment of self-report limitations

Interpretation relies heavily on self-reported literacy and practices but does not mention:
social desirability
conceptual inflation
lack of performance-based verification.

The results contain errors.

Terminology inconsistency :

“assessment behaviours”

“assessment practices”

“testing practices”

These may refer to different constructs but are used interchangeably. Awkward phrasing
“isolated construct, the current results provide evidence...”

This is a comma splice.

It should be two sentences or joined with a conjunction.

Awkward phrasing

“convenience sampling from one Saudi region prevents national generalisation.”

“Saudi region” is awkward; should be “a single region of Saudi Arabia.”

Missing comma

“item-total correlations, and internal consistency support initial use...Comma before “and” is optional, but the sentence reads unevenly

Awkward noun phrase

“the 45-item factor structure was not independently tested.”

“Factor structure” is unclear unless previously defined.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Section numbering inconsistency

Conclusion” is correct, but earlier sections must align (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
Section numbering inconsistency

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Incorrect use of “Article 10”

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10.

APA format for article numbers is:

Language Testing in Asia, 12, 10.

OR

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10. (acceptable only if the journal uses article numbers explicitly)

Check journal guidelines — APA typically uses the article number alone.

Missing issue number

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10.

Incorrect page range format

Potentially incorrect publication year

Mahar & Khoso (2025)

ResearchGate often lists preprints with future years — verify accuracy.

PMC link may not be the final published version

The Gupta (2023) link goes to PubMed Central, which may host:
accepted manuscripts

not the final formatted version

APA prefers the publisher's DOI. Inconsistent journal title capitalization

Journal names must be in title case, but some appear inconsistently formatted.

Accuracy / Source Issues

ResearchGate links

Two references use ResearchGate URLs:

Accuracy / Source Issues

Koloi-Keaikitse & Traynor (2023)

Mahar & Khoso (2025)

Non-standard journal titles

Examples:

International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)

→ Ampersand (&) in journal titles is unusual; verify official name.

International Journal of Education and Social Science Studies

→ Check capitalization and indexing; may not follow APA conventions.

ERIC link may not be the final published version

The Phakiti & Steinhoff (2023) link goes to ERIC, which often hosts:
accepted manuscripts

not the final formatted version

Inconsistent punctuation around volume/issue

Examples:

13(3), 129–132.

17(2), 168–182.

Spacing varies

Incorrect punctuation in author names

N. P. I. P.

Check whether these initials are correct and consistently formatted.

Non-standard journal titles

Examples:

GIST–Education and Learning Research Journal

→ Check capitalization and indexing.

International Journal of Education and Social Science Studies

→ Verify official title formatting.

Inconsistent use of ampersands
Spacing around & varies slightly across entries

DOI formatting inconsistency
Some entries use:

<https://doi.org/...>
Others use:

raw URLs
APA requires all DOIs in URL format.

Missing italics
Journal names and volume numbers must be italicized.
Plain text here does not show italics.
Apostrophe encoding error
In the ResearchGate URL:

Teachers' _Conceptions_of_Assessment
The apostrophe breaks the URL.

. APA Formatting Errors

Incorrect capitalization in article titles
APA requires sentence case for article titles.
You have:

EVALUATING LEARNING OUTCOMES STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING TEACHING
EFFECTIVENESS IN THE CLASSROOM.

→ Entire title is incorrectly in all caps.

EFL Teachers' Conceptions of Designing Classroom-Based Tests.

→ Should be sentence case: only the first word and proper nouns capitalized.

Enhancing assessment literacy for teachers of less commonly taught languages: Insights from
greek as a second language.

→ "Greek" must be capitalized.

Page ranges use hyphen

EFL Teachers' Conceptions of Designing Classroom-Based Tests.

→ Should be sentence case: only the first word and proper nouns capitalized.

Enhancing assessment literacy for teachers of less commonly taught languages: Insights from
greek as a second language.

→ "Greek" must be capitalized.

Page ranges use hyphen

Apostrophe encoding error

In the ResearchGate URL:

Teachers' _Conceptions_ of _Assessment

The apostrophe breaks the URL

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Missing:

Pilot sample size

Demographics

Pilot reliability

Whether pilot feedback informed revisions

No explanation of reviewer agreement.

Incorrect use of “Article 10”

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10.

APA format for article numbers is:

Language Testing in Asia, 12, 10.

OR

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10. (acceptable only if the journal uses article numbers explicitly)

Check journal guidelines — APA typically uses the article number alone.

Missing issue number

Language Testing in Asia, 12, Article 10.

Incorrect page range formatting

Potentially incorrect publication year

Mahar & Khoso (2025)

ResearchGate often lists preprints with future years — verify accuracy.

PMC link may not be the final published version

The Gupta (2023) link goes to PubMed Central, which may host:
accepted manuscripts

not the final formatted version

APA prefers the publisher’s DOI. Inconsistent journal title capitalization

Journal names must be in title case, but some appear inconsistently formatted.

Accuracy / Source Issues

ResearchGate links

Two references use ResearchGate URLs:

Accuracy / Source Issues

Koloi-Keaikitse & Traynor (2023)

Mahar & Khoso (2025)

Non-standard journal titles

Examples:

International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)

→ Ampersand (&) in journal titles is unusual; verify official name.

International Journal of Education and Social Science Studies

→ Check capitalization and indexing; may not follow APA conventions.

ERIC link may not be the final published version

The Phakiti & Steinhoff (2023) link goes to ERIC, which often hosts:
accepted manuscripts

not the final formatted version

Inconsistent punctuation around volume/issue

Examples:

13(3), 129–132.

17(2), 168–182.

Spacing varies

Incorrect punctuation in author names

N. P. I. P.

Check whether these initials are correct and consistently formatted.

Non-standard journal titles

Examples:

GIST–Education and Learning Research Journal

→ Check capitalization and indexing.

International Journal of Education and Social Science Studies

→ Verify official title formatting.

Inconsistent use of ampersands

Spacing around & varies slightly across entries

DOI formatting inconsistency

Some entries use:

<https://doi.org/...>

Others use:

raw URLs

APA requires all DOIs in URL format.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes. "Language Assessment Literacy and Classroom-Based Language Testing Practices among EFL Teachers in the Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia" accurately names the two constructs, the population, and the geographic scope. No overclaiming, no mismatch with content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes, and unusually completely — it reports exact sample sizes, response rates, instrument details, means/SDs/alphas, the correlation with CI, and the full regression output, plus an explicit self-report/causality caveat. At 229 words it runs long for most journal templates (commonly 150–200), so the editor may want it trimmed.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Comprehension is never impeded, and I found no clear spelling errors, but there's a recurring layer of non-native-English phrasing: citations placed after the sentence period instead of before it (e.g., "...local testing settings. (Sujianti et al., 2025)."); a singular/plural slip ("the authors attempted... in his/her classroom" for a single-author study); redundant doubling ("regression analysis... revealed that LAL revealed..."); and several non-idiomatic constructions ("In most of the EFL cases..."). A professional copyedit pass would meaningfully improve fluency.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Comprehension is never impeded, and I found no clear spelling errors, but there's a recurring layer of non-native-English phrasing: citations placed after the sentence period instead of before it (e.g., "...local testing settings. (Sujianti et al., 2025)."); a singular/plural slip ("the authors attempted... in his/her classroom" for a single-author study); redundant doubling ("regression analysis... revealed that LAL revealed..."); and several non-idiomatic constructions ("In most of the EFL cases..."). A professional copyedit pass would meaningfully improve fluency.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Yes, they are clear and precise.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes — it stays within what a correlational, self-report design can support and explicitly disclaims causal or verified-practice claims.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

One broken link, confirmed twice in the text: "(Gal & Ryder, 2025)" is cited on two separate occasions but has no corresponding entry anywhere in the reference list. This must be added or the citation removed.

All other 20 references are real, accurately cited, and topically on point — no fabricated or unverifiable sources found.

Minor formatting inconsistency: journal names/volumes are italicized in some entries but not others (roughly splitting along DOI vs. non-DOI entries), which should be harmonized.

The Tewachew (2025) entry is missing page numbers and mis-renders the journal's single running issue number as "30(30)" (volume-and-issue) when the source is simply "No. 30, pp. 57–80."

Minor spelling inconsistency: "Paceño" in the reference list vs. "Paceno" in-text.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a methodologically careful, transparently reported study with a clear contribution — linking LAL to reported classroom practices rather than treating LAL as an isolated construct, and doing so with a mixed secondary/tertiary, public/private sample that is explicit about its own limits. Please address before publication: (1) add the missing "Gal & Ryder (2025)" reference or remove the two citations to it; (2) have a fluent English editor pass over the manuscript for the recurring phrasing/agreement issues noted above; (3) harmonize reference-list formatting (italics, and complete the Tewachew page range/issue format); (4) consider trimming the abstract toward your target journal's word limit. None of this requires new data collection or re-analysis.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title need to be revised by adding An analysis/ An investigation some phrases like these.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Abstract need to be more summarize

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Improve some sentence structures

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Research questions need to be restated. They should not started with helping verbs Is/Am/Are and etc When research questions will be changed research methodology will also need to be changed. Research methodology need to be stated clearly in one or two lines.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

When research questions will be changed results will also be changed.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

When research questions will be changed Conclusion or summary will also be changed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are fine

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Revise research questions and research methodology, data analysis, and results will also be revised accordingly.
